

PLANNING COMMITTEE
10TH SEPTEMBER 2024

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AFTER PREPARATION OF THE AGENDA

ITEM 5.7 – 24/00571/VCOND – VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING APPLICATION 21/00617/FUL – REINSTATEMENT OF EXTERNAL CLADDING AT 2 HOLLOWBROOK, CLATTERWAY, BONSTALL

Representation received from Councillor Buckler:

Colleagues,

I asked for this application for variation to be considered at Committee because I wanted you to discuss the issues arising from it.

Firstly, it is important to say that, as I understand it, the issues around non-compliance raised in the officer report have all been addressed and explained to the officers by the applicant.

Secondly, in 2019, as a Council we declared a Climate Emergency because we felt that it was important that we did what we could to address the very real threat of climate change, and the impact that it will have on our society and communities. This is supported by some of our existing Local Plan policies, our Climate Change SPD and revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The applicant in this case has taken every effort to minimise the environmental impact of this application. All of the materials proposed are the most sustainable that can be used.

Mr. Taylor asked to use reclaimed timber for the cladding for the building but was told because it was in a Conservation area, he would “have to take the carbon hit for the cement render and not use the cladding”. This requirement would have exceeded the carbon footprint of the rest of the construction.

I believe that the impacts on the policies outlined in the officer’s report for this application are not contravened by the proposals and therefore the recommendation in the report is a matter of opinion and not fact, and so should be discussed.

We have approved the building as proposed in terms of its scale, location, height etc, apart from the surface material, suggesting that it is not fundamentally against policy PD1.

There are existing buildings within the Bonsall conservation area which are timber clad, suggesting that the external materials are not fundamentally against policy PD2.

Finally, as outlined in the report, in relation to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, less than substantial harm to a heritage asset (such as the Bonsall Conservation Area), such as is outlined in this proposal, must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

The officer report regards there to be no public benefit to the scheme.

However, under paragraph 8 of the NPPG, there are 3 potential areas of public benefit for a scheme such as this. These are:

1. an economic benefit;
2. A social objective or
3. an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

As outlined very clearly by Mr. Taylor, the carbon footprint of the construction and operation of this development would be significantly reduced through the proposed external materials and therefore there is a public benefit under paragraph 8 of the NPPg. This also supports our policy PD7, relating to Climate change, as well as our supplementary planning document on climate Change, none of which is mentioned in the officer report.

Mr. Taylor's neighbours support this application. The Parish Council support this application as they both agree that it will have no impact on the Conservation Area.

How should we balance the "less than significant impact" of a development on a Conservation Area, as opposed to our aspirations to reduce the carbon footprint of our district, which I think Mr Taylor attempts to do in this application?

The issues around this should be being discussed by Councillors, which is why I asked for this application to come before you and I hope that you agree that it is an issue which is worthy of debate.

Thank you for your consideration.

ITEM 5.8 – 24/00625/VCOND – VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2, 4 AND 8 OF PLANNING PERMISSION NO. 23/00959/LBALT – VARIOUS CHANGES TO RELATED CONDITIONS AT MARKET PLACE AND VICTORIA SQUARE, ASHBOURNE

Representation received from Michael Gallimore citing the following:

Further to your letter dated 25/07/2024, we are concerned about taking away the parking in the Market Place area. A lot of customers coming to the cinema have mobility problems and with the lack of parking, they will have to park quite a long way away. We have installed a list costing approx £35,000; and then to find that the parking on the Market Place is being taken away is ridiculous.

First and foremost, Ashbourne needs a bypass - the proposals for the Market Square are not necessary.